

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

May 2, 2001

LB 75

fuel will help meet the energy requirements necessary to safeguard life, health, property, and public welfare of our citizens." I don't know how many of you all would write this language, how many of you all endorse it as being the policy you want to have declared to the whole world as being the policy of this Legislature. People are entitled to presume that we've read about this, that we've read it, we've thought about it, we've analyzed it and it has a valid ring to it. Personally, I don't believe that the production, sale, or use of ethanol is going to safeguard the life of anybody. There's a stretch when you get to the matter of health, because nobody can show that the health of the public in Nebraska has been damaged due to the fact that not much ethanol is being used as a fuel. I can't think of any property that is going to be safeguarded through the use of ethanol. I don't know what is meant by the term "public welfare", except in the broadest sense of including all of those things that contribute to a healthy, wholesome, happy life, and I don't think production and sale of ethanol is going to contribute to that at all except for those investors, producers and purveyors of ethanol. I cannot see that the public interest is affected by a statewide emphasis on the use of ethanol through the instrumentality of taking away the choice of retail merchants to stock the product they want to stock. I had handed out an article a few days ago. I don't have a copy on my desk, but it was from the Lincoln Journal Star quoting a person who is selling gasoline in one of the smaller towns. He had said that a merchant will stock and offer to customers whatever the customers demand. His customers don't demand ethanol so he doesn't stock it. He can't sell it. He concluded that the Legislature, however, must have a different point of view. Despite the fact that his customers are not asking for ethanol, despite the fact that he believes it will not sell, the Legislature is going to compel him to sell it at his station. I do not think that is what the Legislature should do. I do not think the Legislature should adopt language that purports to declare a public policy with which we do not agree. I don't agree with this language. Maybe what I ought to do, but I won't because it's not an amendment, I wouldn't try to divide the question on this even if it were an amendment. Taken as a whole, it does not articulate a policy that the Legislature should stand behind. If people think that I am wrong or that my